

transmitting the data, only the one that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in independent claim 1.

Yamamoto also does not teach or suggest a communication apparatus including "a control circuit that controls the master unit and the plurality of slave units, wherein when the master unit makes a request to the remote center for transmitting the data, the control circuit prohibits the plurality of slave units from receiving and storing therein the data transmitted from the remote center, and when one of the plurality of slave units makes the request, the control circuit prohibits the master unit from storing the data transmitted from the remote center and prohibits other ones of the plurality of slave units from receiving and storing therein the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in independent claim 8.

Yamamoto also does not teach or suggest a communication apparatus including "a control circuit that controls the communication apparatus and the plurality of slave units, wherein when one of the communication apparatus and the plurality of slave units makes a request to the remote center for transmitting the data, only the one that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in independent claim 14.

Further, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a communication apparatus including "a control circuit that controls the communication apparatus and the master unit, wherein when one of the communication apparatus and the master unit makes a request to the remote center for transmitting the data, only the one that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the remote center, as recited in independent claim 21.

Yamamoto teaches, in Fig. 1, a facsimile apparatus 100 that communicates to a World Wide Web server via a line L. See page 3, paragraph [0049]. The facsimile apparatus 100 includes a device body 20 having a radio unit 3 and a browsing and electronic mail function unit 1 that receive electronic mail data and/or Internet data from the server and/or a plurality

of portable terminals 7. See Fig. 1, and pages 3 and 4, paragraphs [0049] and [0055] - [0064], [0068], [0072] and [0076]. Therefore, the portable terminals 7 act as remote centers in which data may be transmitted to the device body 20.

The facsimile apparatus 100 also includes a controller 5 that classifies the Internet data and/or the electronic mail data, which are received by the browsing and electronic mail function unit 1 or the portable terminal 7 via the radio unit 3, into simple information and detailed information. See page 4, paragraph [0068]. Although the facsimile apparatus 100 may use the controller 5 to select/control the data to be transferred to the facsimile apparatus 100, the controller 5 may also transfer and receive data to a cordless slave unit 6 belonging to the device body 20. See page 3, page 3, paragraph [0048], and page 5, paragraphs [0077] - [0081].

In addition to storage by the device body 20 (master unit), Yamamoto also teaches that the cordless slave unit 6 (slave unit) receives and stores simple information received from the server and/or portable terminals 7 (remote unit). Although the cordless slave unit 6 (slave unit) also transmits record command information to the device body 20, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest that the cordless slave unit 6 makes a request to the server and/or portable terminals 7 (remote unit). See page 6, paragraph [0092]. Because information requested by the device 20 is also received and stored by the cordless slave unit 6, Yamamoto cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest that only the unit that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the server and/or portable terminals 7 (remote unit) and that receipt and storage of the data is prohibited by the other units.

The Office Action recognizes that Yamamoto does not teach or suggest that only the one that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the remote center, as recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 21. The Office Action also

recognizes that Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a control circuit that prohibits a slave and master units from receiving and storing data transmitted from a remote center, as recited in independent claim 8.

However, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include only a requested unit that is allowed to receive and store transmitted data from a remote center because only one request signal is sent to the remote center and the remote center only needs to send the response to the requested one. For the reasons discussed above, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yamamoto as alleged by the Office Action. It is not clear whether the Office is relying solely on Yamamoto as a basis for rejection. If so, the Office Action has not provided a prima facie basis for motivation.

The Office Action also asserts that Hayashi remedies the deficiencies of Yamamoto. Notwithstanding these assertions, Hayashi does not teach or suggest that only the one that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the remote center, as set forth in claims 1, 14 and 21. Further, Hayashi does not teach or suggest that when one unit makes a request to a remote unit, a control circuit prohibits the other units from storing and receiving data transmitted from the remote unit, as set forth in claim 8.

Hayashi teaches, in Fig. 1, a facsimile apparatus 1 including a main body 2 and a remote unit 3 (cordless telephone set) connected to the main body 2 by radio communication. See col. 2, lines 59-67, and 4, lines 1-63. According to a type of the reception signal received from a caller (remote center) via the telephone line 6, the telephone line 6 is either connected to a remote unit 3 (cordless telephone set) or a base unit 5 of the main body. See Abstract, col. 1, lines 31-42, col. 4, lines 23-27, and col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 53. Therefore, the reception signal from the telephone line 6 includes a request to for a facsimile communication by the base unit 5 or a ringing burst by the remote unit 3 (cordless telephone set).

Because Hayashi does not teach or suggest that the remote unit 3 (slave unit) and/or the base unit 5 (master unit) makes a request to the caller (remote center), Hayashi cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest that only the unit that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the data transmitted from the caller (remote center) and that receipt and storage of the transmitted data is prohibited by the other units. For at least these reasons, Hayashi does not remedy the deficiencies of Yamamoto.

Kindo also does not remedy the deficiencies of Yamamoto and Hayashi, as discussed above.

Therefore, claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 would not have been rendered obvious by Yamamoto, Hayashi and Kindo, either alone or in any permissible combination. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-20 and 22-27 variously depend from claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Yamamoto, Hayashi and Kindo, either alone or in any permissible combination, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features that these claims recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

II. Claim for Priority

The Office Action indicates that the certified copy of the priority document has been filed in "parent application No.JP 2001-55257." This is not correct. The certified copy was filed in the present application on March 18, 2002. If the certified copy is not present in the Patent Office file for the present application, the Examiner is requested to notify the undersigned.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNH

Date: November 16, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461